

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 15-20 stand rejected in the Non-Final Office action mailed March 30, 2011. To better point out and claim what applicants regard as their invention, applicants have amended claims 1 and 17 and have cancelled claims 15 and 16. Ample antecedent basis exists in applicants' specification for the claim amendments so applicants have added no new matter. Following this amendment, claims 1-6 and 17-20 will remain in this application. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections in view of claim amendments and accompanying remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection of Claim 17

The examiner has rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as failing to distinctly point out and claim what applicants' regard as their invention. In particular, the examiner contends that applicants' "means" fail to clearly link or associate structure, material or acts to the claimed function.

While applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's rejection, applicants have nonetheless amended claim 17 to no longer recite means plus function elements. As now amended, claim 17 now recites a processor in place of the "means for establishing a plurality of states", "means for associating", and means for actuating". Instead of reciting "means for storing", applicants have amended claim 17 to recite a memory. The elimination of the means plus function elements from claim 17 renders the claim clear and in full in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claim 17.

Applicants have also cancelled claims 15-16 as being duplicative of claims 5 and 6.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over US Patent, 3,758,712 to John. P. Hudson, in view of US Patent 5,262,865 to William Herz, further in view of US Published Patent Application 2004/0036632 to Richard L. Ford,

further in view of US Patent 6,452,612 to Alex Holtz. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In rejecting claim 1, the examiner contends that Hudson shows a video special effects production device which has a physical control panel with actuators. The examiner cites the Herz patent to show the desirability of having buttons/actuators for selecting different production device states. Further, the examiner cites the Ford published application to show the desirability of having a limited number of buttons control a larger number of states by making the buttons programmable. Lastly, the examiner cites the Holtz et al. patent for the showing the desirability using such programmable buttons/actuators on a video production control panel.

Assuming *arguendo* that the examiner has correctly characterized the Hudson, Herz, Ford and Holtz et al. references, (which applicants do not concede), the combination of references still does not show all of the features of applicants' amended claim 1. For example, the examiner has not pointed to any disclosure in any references of the following step:

responsive to selection of each memory object, physically displacing the at least one displaceable actuator to control an operation of the at least one production device in accordance with the at least one operation associated with that state memory object so the actuator manifests a status of the production device.

In particular, the examiner has not specifically pointed to any teaching in Hudson, Herz, Ford, or Holtz et al. of physically displacing a displaceable actuator to manifests a status of the production device. Herz says nothing about physically displacing a displaceable actuator to manifests a status of the production device. At best, Hudson shows a control panel having actuators and Ford et al. shows the ability to program information on buttons. Again, none of Hudson, Ford or Herz nor their combination teaches the desirability of physically displacing a displaceable actuator to manifests a status of the production device.

Applicants have described the Holtz et al. patent at pages 2-3 of their specification. From that discussion, the examiner should appreciate that applicants' claimed invention seeks to address a specific problem with respect to automated video production not taught or suggested by Holtz et al. In particular, Holtz et al. does not address the desirability of namely changing the state of a production device

control panel to reflect changes in the state of production devices controlled in response to an execution of a memory object as recited in applicants' claims.

In summary, none of the references, either alone or in any combination, teach all of the features of amended claim 1, including the step of:

responsive to selection of each memory object, physically displacing the at least one displaceable actuator to control an operation of the at least one production device in accordance with the at least one operation associated with that state memory object so the actuator manifests a status of the production device.

Therefore amended claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the art of record, warranting withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of the claim.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and incorporate by reference all of the features thereof. Therefore, claims 2-6 patentably distinguish over the art of record for the same reasons as given above for claim 1. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 2-6.

Claim 17, as now amended recites the following:

the processor being responsive to selection of each memory object, for initiating physical displacement of at least one displaceable actuator of the at least one production device to control an operation of the at least one production device in accordance with the at least one operation associated with that state memory object so the actuator manifests a status of the production device

Thus, like claim 1, claim 17 recites the feature of physically displacing a displaceable actuator so the actuator manifests a status of the production device. None of the cited art teaches this feature so claim 17 recites patentable subject matter. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of this claim.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17 and incorporate by reference all of the features thereof. Therefore claims 18-20 patentably distinguish over the art of record for the same reasons as given above for claim 17. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 18-20.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,
Edward M. Casaccia et al

By: /Robert B. Levy/
Robert B. Levy
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
April 25, 2011